



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

WU

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,938	08/02/2001	Ian Latchford	AMAT/4227.P1/DD/BCVD/JW	8367
32588	7590	06/04/2004		
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC. 2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061 SANTA CLARA, CA 95050				
			EXAMINER WALKE, AMANDA C	
			ART UNIT 1752	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/921,938	LATCHFORD ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Amanda C Walke	1752	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15, 17 and 19-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15, 17 and 19-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/8/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

In light of the amendment filed 3/25/2004, the rejections made in the previous office action have been dropped, however, in an updated search, new references have been found and a new rejection follows.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-15, 17, and 19-35 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 5, 9-11, 17-24, 27, 34, and 37 of copending Application No. 10/799146 in view of Lin et al (6,187,505). Application number 10/799146 claims a method for processing a substrate comprising the steps of depositing an amorphous carbon layer on the substrate, depositing a layer of resist on the amorphous carbon layer, patterning the layer of resist, then etching the pattern into the amorphous carbon layer. The claims are silent with respect to the type of resist material and the type of radiation employed to pattern the layer of resist.

Lin et al teaches a silicon containing resist sensitive to UV or DUV radiation having a silicon content of 5% by wt, preferably 10% by weight. The use of the resist results in good thermal stability and small isolated and dense feature bias.

Given the teachings of Lin et al, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare a device by the method of 10/799146 employing the resist (sensitive to UV radiation) of Lin et al to achieve in good thermal stability and small isolated and dense feature bias, thus preparing a device by the instantly claimed method.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

3. Claims 1-15, 17, and 19-35 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 8, 9, and 19 of copending Application No. 10/800112 in view of Lin et al. Application number 10/800112 claims a method for processing a substrate comprising the steps of depositing an amorphous carbon layer on the substrate, depositing a layer of resist on the amorphous carbon layer, patterning the layer of resist, then etching the pattern into the amorphous carbon layer. The claims are silent with respect to the type of resist material and the type of radiation employed to pattern the layer of resist.

Lin et al teaches a silicon containing resist sensitive to UV or DUV radiation having a silicon content of 5% by wt, preferably 10% by weight. The use of the resist results in good thermal stability and small isolated and dense feature bias.

Given the teachings of Lin et al, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare a device by the method of 10/800112 employing the resist (sensitive to UV

radiation) of Lin et al to achieve in good thermal stability and small isolated and dense feature bias, thus preparing a device by the instantly claimed method.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda C Walke whose telephone number is 571-272-1337. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 5:30-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on 571-272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Amanda C. Walke
Examiner
Art Unit 1752

ACW
May 31, 2004